

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/696,840

Applicant(s)

WEISBRODT ET AL.

Examiner

Alison K. Pickard

Art Unit

3676

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alison K. Pickard

(3) _____

(2) Paul Malszewski

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 April 2009

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all of record

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant called to clarify the notice of non-compliance of 3-13-09. Applicant argued the new limitations were not limited to a single embodiment. The examiner disagreed and noted the specification did not appear to support the features in all embodiments.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Alison K. Pickard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3676